

they make the journey north. There is nothing compassionate about the open border policy of this administration.

It didn't have to happen. It should not have happened, and the blame rests squarely with President Biden and the open-border Democrats. In less than 2 months, President Biden has already shown himself the most open-borders President in our history as a Nation. It is no surprise that the whole world has noticed.

This crisis will not fix itself. We need to take action. Republicans have a series of commonsense solutions to improve this situation immediately. They include enforcing the law, securing the border, and restoring the policy called "Remain in Mexico." Without these, the Biden border crisis is going to continue to undermine our Nation's safety and its security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and then, after me, Senators LEAHY and PETERS be allowed to complete our remarks in their entirety before the scheduled vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, the debate about the legislative filibuster is not a debate about S. 1 or S. 101 or S. 901. No, this is a debate about nothing less than the nature and durability of American self-government. Quite apart from the wrestling over which particular bill was filibustered 8 years ago or 4 years ago or 2 years ago or tomorrow, the decision about whether or not to eliminate the filibuster is the Senate's most important policy debate in decades.

Eliminating the filibuster would obviously have all kinds of policy consequences, from tax rates and labor law to energy and infrastructure. But that is not why the debate is so important. This isn't fundamentally a debate about this or that policy.

The debate about the filibuster is deeper than that because it is a debate about how and whether we debate at all. This matters a whole lot in a country this big, in a continental nation, because it is right at the heart of how peaceable self-government works at all. If we just blow that up, if we act as if it is just a matter of time before the filibuster goes away and all we really have is red-versus-blue jerseys anyway, if we just end the Senate's rules as they have existed for 240 years, we will dramatically alter not just this institution but our entire form of self-government, and in the process we will dramatically escalate the fevered pitch of America's recent arguing.

We shouldn't ignore the deep and long-term significance of what setting the Senate's rules on fire would mean simply because terms like "super-majority requirement" don't fit really neatly into our modern, made-for-

cable-TV, soap-opera variety of politics as entertainment, politics as sport, even politics as religion. "Super-majority requirements" are a whole bunch of syllables, and it just doesn't make for great sound bites.

But make no mistake. If we set the Senate's rules on fire, we are going to cause dramatic, horrible consequences in American civic life.

Almost every single Member of the newly minted Democratic majority in the Senate has resolved in recent weeks that the legislative filibuster needs to be abolished, or, in their most recent focus group term, to be "reformed" out of existence.

This move would be directly contrary to over two centuries of tradition in this country and in this body. It would be directly contrary to the Founders' explicit purposes for why this institution was created at all, and it would be directly contrary to the words of dozens and dozens of the majority Senators—their words just in the last 48 months.

This is no mere procedural change. If they go through with this, an already sick Senate would be committing institutional suicide. There really is no reason to be a U.S. Senator if the Senate doesn't exist to foster real debate that is bigger than simple majority power.

This nuclear trigger would all but destroy the principle of consensus-building that the Senate demands and, thereby, all but ensure that minority rights in this country would become subject to more and more fickle, more and more power hungry, and, inevitably, more and more abusive simple majorities.

America is built on a number of seemingly small, but actually quite grand, ideas. One of the very best of those ideas, one that is just elegantly simple—so simple that we regularly don't pause to reflect on it together and to teach it to our kids—is the simple idea that whenever possible, groups of different people should be allowed to make different rules for themselves. This is what our system of federalism is about. This is why we divide power both vertically and horizontally between legislative, executive, and judicial branches, and then also across the 50 States and versus the Federal Government.

It is not actually an extravagant thought. Children on a playground kind of instinctively understand that if you can't get one giant game of kickball together, it is OK to let the playground divide up into a few different games of kickball and dodgeball. It is a grand American tradition that when we don't have to agree, we don't have to agree about everything. It is OK to allow some diversity. It is OK for not all workplace regulations to be exactly the same everywhere in the country.

As it happens, America is a really big country, a continental nation, and we regularly don't agree. Californians don't always agree with Nebraskans. Virginians don't always agree with

New Yorkers. People in regularly sunny Miami don't always see the world exactly the same as folks in regularly wintry Boston do. Ohio State fans don't have to wear the blue and gold of Michigan.

It is a big country full of disagreements, and so our principle is, regularly, that wherever we can protect and respect differences, we should. We don't force folks to wear the jerseys of the teams they don't support. There is no reason to.

I feel like there is some joke I should make about Oral Roberts versus Harbaugh—I know relative competitions against Ohio State—but prudence recommends skipping that.

There are also circumstances, obviously, where we need to make big wide-ranging monopolistic government decisions. There are times when we have to have one-size-fits-all rules, but those one-size-fits-all obligations are not for everything. Even in those moments when they are required, we still want to work hard to protect the rights of minorities and dissenters.

So how do we respect their rights and abilities to make rules for varying communities across a nation of 330 million people from shore to shore? How do we allow as many people as possible to make divergent rules as they see fit? One of the ways we have done that traditionally in the Senate is we have always made sure, here, where we come from all across the country—east to west, north to south—that we would be required to pass legislation not by 50 plus 1 but by 50 plus 10.

What that means is that, most all of the time, even if you are in the majority, you can't just do everything you want. You can't just pass one, big, compulsory law immediately without lots of debate, because you rarely have 50 plus 10. You have to bring some people from across the aisle over to your side. If you are in the majority, it means that you have to learn the habit of sitting down with Members of the minority. You have to talk to them. As importantly, you have to listen to them.

When this process of compromise works and a bill is passed, you are then guaranteed that the new law has the stamp of approval of at least some representatives of the minority on that issue, and it means that they will become your allies against quickly undoing that law next year. They will become your allies because the process of compromise has led you to listen to each other and say: Instead of doing the 51-percent thing, what harder work might be required to get to the 60-percent thing?

If the process of compromise breaks down, that is a pretty important signal as well. When you are forced to make rules that are binding on diverse groups of people, it is in everyone's interest that you get as much buy-in as possible. That makes it more likely that the new rule will be respected and followed beyond just this 2-year Congress. Yet, if you shove a rule change

through with a bare-knuckle majority, you ensure that 49 percent of the country is going to resent not just the rule but you. Pass laws today with a 50-plus-1 majority, and watch them be repealed tomorrow with a 50-plus-1 majority. Our Nation would just pinball from one policy agenda to another. It makes politics too central in the lives of the American people to allow a fickle 51-and-49-percent majority to change the whole direction of the Nation. Each election would become more do or die, more Flight 93ish than the last one. Each campaign would descend further and further into tribal ugliness.

In a big and diverse country, the Senate exists to force lawmakers to build a healthy consensus before we try to make sweeping national, legal changes. The Senate exists precisely to force this kind of consensus-building. That is really why this institution exists. It is how we guarantee that we do not have laws on the books that are respected by half of the country and resented and hated or ignored by the other half of the country. The Senate's supermajority requirement has helped to ensure that big changes are not impulsive and narrow and instant but, rather, deliberate and broadly accepted.

But there is an alarming trend in our time. Let's be clear: It is in both parties. It is not just the Democrats, who are now in the majority, who are interested in this kind of new, more instant, more urgent, more winner-take-all kind of politics. There is a new trend toward a bare-knuckles belief that this is the only kind of politics that works, that it is the only kind of way you can go forward.

So my colleagues—again, in both parties—have decided that if you have the power, you should wield it, and you should wield all of it with no constraint. They might use this or that particular bill as a stalking horse for the attempted power grab, but let's be clear: Any particular bill is beside the point; it is about the new "ends justify the means" principle, which is the principle that there are no principles except that of flexing your power as vigorously and as brutally and as instantly as you can for as long as you can cling to power.

Some of the Republicans who have already spoken on the floor this last week have warned the Democrats that they might very soon rue the day they made this decision. There is an age-old self-delusion in power that says: If you are in the majority, you will never have to be in the minority again, so why would you want to respect any rules that have traditionally protected minorities? You will always be driving the bulldozer and never be in its path.

This debate isn't about policy. It isn't about any specific bill. You can listen to the activists on the outside who are advocating for it. They have been transparent about their purposes for the better part of a year that they would use whatever bill they think most politically opportune at the mo-

ment to try to end the filibuster. Books published on this topic in the last 60 days haven't come about in the last 60 days.

We should remember that if this happens, if a simple majoritarianism—a mere raw exercise of power—becomes what this body is about, we will have taken a step down a path toward the exercise of naked power that will be absolutely permanent. It cannot and will not ever be undone. Once the supermajority rules, once the filibuster is gone, it will be gone forever because no one—it is self-evident to make this argument—is ever going to voluntarily surrender power when the other party has just used a simple-majority power against them. No one will ever restore supermajority requirements when they have a simple majority and a simple majority has just become the rule against them.

If you want to see American politics become more brutal, if you want to see American politics become more crude, if you want to see American politics become more demagogic, then stripping away the mechanisms that have forced us to work together would be the perfect recipe for bringing about this dystopian reality. If you want to see a politics that favors more candidates running for office with claims that they will be strongmen and tyrants, then make politics nothing more than a contest of wills between people who spend their campaigns promising to spend the next 2 or 4 years simply making the other side pay. If you want to see the rights and interests of minority groups scorned, dismissed, and trampled, then establish a legislative process where minority voices don't need to be heard at all. That is what would happen if we end the supermajority requirements that have always dominated the Senate from its first day. If you want lame, meme politics that aims only to "own the libs" or "drink conservative tears," this is how you bring that crap show about. You would set the Senate on fire.

All of you know this, though. Many of you have spoken in private about this being a rash move. Many of you have spoken in public about having been opposed to this before.

I think of my friend BRIAN SCHATZ—and I am going to name him precisely because he is a real friend, not a Washington friend, where you claim someone is your friend right before you try to rip his face off. I actually like the guy a lot. I like working with the guy, and I would like to keep working with the guy. But it turns out, if you make the Senate into the House of Representatives, there is going to be almost no working together across the aisle because there will no longer be any incentive for it. All the politics that matter will happen during the private caucus lunches where 51 percent will try to keep their 51 percent to do whatever they want.

The Senate is, obviously, not the greatest deliberative body in the world,

but it still has a chance to recover. Set it on fire by ending supermajority requirements, and no one should ever utter the phrase "great deliberative body" again because there will be no more deliberation in this body again.

BRIAN recently said that the filibuster is "stupid and paralyzing." He also said: "It is time to trash the Jim Crow filibuster." Yet, just 4 years ago, when Donald Trump was elected and the House Republicans were itching to have the Senate eliminate the filibuster because the Republicans controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, Senator SCHATZ and a bunch of his colleagues actually penned a public letter that defended the filibuster and all of its "existing rules, practices, and traditions" precisely because it advanced the deliberative purposes of the Senate. I don't remember Senator SCHATZ then calling it the "Jim Crow filibuster" when he wrote that letter or when he was blocking TIM SCOTT's police reform legislation last year by pointing to the Senate's supermajority requirement rules. I don't remember Senator SCHATZ calling it "stupid" when he filibustered COVID relief in September and again in October under the Senate's current rules.

Look, I want to be clear. I am not picking on BRIAN; I am naming him precisely because I like him, and afterward, we can argue about this. With other people I have maybe less of a relationship with, it would be less useful to cite them than the people with whom I actually have a lot of comity and good will. I do want to keep working with BRIAN, but in a simple majoritarian body, there won't be bipartisan cooperation anymore. There isn't much right now, but there is still a chance for the reform of this institution. Ending the filibuster is to end this institution.

To be clear, this isn't about Senator SCHATZ. I could give an hours'-and-hours'-long speech and go through all the flip-flopers in this Chamber who had one position 48 months ago and now have a completely different position. I don't need to name all of them. We should just ask, what changed? We know what changed. The only thing that has changed in the last 2 years is who is in power.

When the Democrats were in the minority, you were fierce defenders of this indispensable Senate prerogative. That was the language that was used. The filibuster was standing between America and fascism, we heard. But now, when you have the slimmest majority—actually, it is just 50-50, and you need the VP's motorcade to break a tie—the filibuster is standing between you and some of your legislative goals; therefore, it needs to be tossed out. When you were using the filibuster to halt Senator SCOTT's police reform bill, the filibuster was an essential American institution that forced compromise. Now that it can be occasionally used to resist a 51-50 straight

majoritarian exercise of power, it is supposedly exclusively a relic of slavery and a tool of Jim Crow. It is nonsense, and the people saying it know that it is nonsense. You used the same rule last year, and you were not racist when you used it last year.

This is B.S. that has been focus-grouped, and particular bills are being used as the excuses to grab power that won't just be for this bill; it will be forever. It will be the end of the Senate.

Was the filibuster really a tool of Jim Crow when it was used against TIM SCOTT last year? I don't think so, and I don't think any of you think so. If somebody wants to come to the floor and repent of their racism for having used the filibuster last year, please do, but that isn't what was happening, so stop with the nonsense rhetoric that is just for an MSNBC sound bite tonight.

It is sad to watch so many of my colleagues who know better be bullied into this position of shortsightedness, and they do know better, because many of you say it in private, and you are being bullied by the fringes of your party. But part of the responsibility of being a U.S. Senator is standing up to the extreme fringes of your party. Part of the responsibility of being a U.S. Senator is to say: I know that people are angry. I know that people are yelling. I know that there are hot-heads. But one of the jobs of a Senator and surely the job of this body is to try to find a way to allow cooler heads to prevail.

We already have an institution that is instantly responsive to majorities—you only have to walk 200 yards to see it—and there is nobody who serves in this body who wishes they served in that body. We know what it looks like to have a simple majoritarian body, and the House was designed to do that. It is a good thing. The House was designed to reflect the energy of the people. When the people are hotheaded and they want something done fast and they want their majority to act, they call on the House and get a hearing, but the Senate's job, the Senate's purpose, is different.

The House is actually allowed to act with a hothead precisely because the Senate exists to cool those passions. The Senate exists to act with a cool head. Our job is not to cater to sudden and instant majorities and to changes in the wind; the Senate's job is to enlarge and refine the House's judgments and to try to build a consensus that can last so that the majority's will can be advanced while the minority's rights are also protected.

The bullies who want to permanently upend the way our legislature works don't understand that their short-term gain of this or that bill will come at a long-term cost of the entire structure of the rights and interests of our constitutional balance.

It doesn't take a lot of courage to go with the current of a mob, but a lot of Senators who quietly want to resist this change—and there are many on

that side of the aisle who want to resist this change—are worried that going against the tide means watching dollars and votes flow away. It means getting screamed at in restaurants. It means that your self-interest is to avoid the short-term pain and ride the short-term wave.

Let me tell you, this feels pretty familiar. When I ran for this seat in 2014—it was the first time I had ever run for anything in my life—one of the fundamental reasons I ran, in my having never sought any office of any kind, was that I thought the Senate had a chance to still be restored to its deliberative place in American life.

We are living through a digital revolution that is disrupting the future of work, the future of war, the nature of local community, the neuron, synapse, and frontal lobe formations of our teens. The digital revolution is transforming American life everywhere, and this institution has a chance to help shape some of that for good instead of to just allow the tide to flow at full speed and consume this institution as well.

So I said, I pledged—and when I said it to a largely red State in 2014, most people apparently didn't think I meant it—that I wasn't running just because I disagreed with a lot of President Obama's policies but because I would defend the constitutional system of limited government and a Senate that exists for a deliberative process even if someone in my own party came to power and urged instant, radical changes that disrespected large portions of America.

I literally made the centerpiece of why I was running that I would resist someone in my own party who tried to do majoritarian, instant stuff. And I can tell you, I can introduce you to a whole bunch of Republicans on the ground in Nebraska who are really mad that, when I said that, I didn't precisely say it 17 different ways, where I named every person that they might later want to have all of that instant power.

After the 2016 election, people started looking back at what I said the whole 2014 campaign and got more uncomfortable with what they voted for. So nobody has to tell me how unpleasant it is to stand up and say things that are unpopular in your own party.

Over the course of the last 5 years, I have been smeared and censured many times. I have been cussed out by lots of people who once supported me and called me a friend. None of that was particularly fun, but so what?

The oath I took and the duty I swore was related to the point of being a U.S. Senator, which is that if you are not willing to stand up to your own side every now and again, there is really no point in having this job. And the thing is, a lot of you know that.

I am not going to say it is the consensus position on your side of the aisle, but there are a whole bunch of people going along publicly with the

rhetoric of ending the filibuster and ending supermajority requirements, even as, at the exact same time, you tell me how much you regret the summer of 2013 decision to allow Harry Reid to end a much smaller Senate tradition about supermajority confirmations.

Supermajoritarian confirmations are a small item compared to the change that is being considered here. Harry Reid's take-no-prisoners strategy of 2013 was something that was moved unanimously by the then-majority party, and many, many, many of you have talked to me in private about how much you regret it. Please consider the costs because this would be a much larger change.

Whenever anyone, Republican or Democrat, has threatened to blow up the Senate supermajority requirements, they always have to tell themselves three lies. The first lie is that might makes right. The second lie is that the other side politically is your enemy, and they must simply be beaten down; they can never possibly be persuaded. And the third lie is that the Federal Government is the only government we have. None of these things is true.

I resisted a President, nominally of my own party, when he beat me up, both in private and in public, for defending the filibuster when my party was in the majority.

Republican Senate leaders stood up to him as well, despite lots of ridicule from House Republicans. A lot of people in the House Republican caucus wanted much faster politics, but their passions were a poor guide to long-term wisdom for a nation this big and diverse. It is better for America's hardest debates to be decided in a deliberative Senate rather than in the thunderdome.

Republicans in the majority held firm against blowing up this central structural pillar of this institution, even when it would have benefited us politically. In other words, we faced the same choice then that you face now, and we decided that it was better to choose long-term stability over short-term legislative victories. It was the right choice for a nation this big and this diverse.

A lot of Republicans think that decision was naive. Their argument was the other side hates us. They will definitely use all power against us whenever they can. And I know that many Democratic strategists on the outside, many people raising money, small-dollar fundraising online, they are making the exact same argument, but this isn't war, and we are not supposed to be permanent enemies.

We want a politics of debate and of verbal jousting rather than of physical violence. And one of the most urgent political tasks we face today is to demonstrate that it is possible for people who deeply disagree and who are polarized in our division—we can still work together for the common good.

We urgently need to protect and strengthen, not weaken and destroy, the norms that force us to come together and cooperate.

But we don't need to be naive. We don't need to believe that that means we would always sing "Kumbaya." We obviously don't in this body, but that doesn't mean we are free to be naive in the other direction as well.

For every step we take that further divides, further infuriates, and further inflames half the country, it makes it far likelier that we will set a fire that we cannot put out.

The American Founders understood the problem that we are facing. They were not naive about how politics worked and what it took, what kind of labor and sweat and relational hand-wringing and bread-breaking it takes to be able to work together amicably. They were working from a personal experience of repression, tyranny, and violence. And so they set out some basic principles of federalism, localism, and consensus building, of supporting majorities but without sacrificing minorities. And so they established a framework in which these principles could be balanced in a way that is responsive to changing conditions and needs.

The Founders' concerns are still our concerns, but guess what. They built the Senate for this exact moment. We are constantly tussling over how to make sure that every voice is heard and every person has a place. We live in a divided time. We live in a divided nation. But they lived in a divided time and in a divided nation, and so they created the Senate to be a place that could deescalate red-hot anger, to take a deep breath rather than just assuming that a runaway majority of 50 percent plus 1 should advance whatever it wanted.

Friends, colleagues, you know after the summer of 2013, the dominoes were worse than you had expected, and many of you—I don't know if it is most, but many of you have talked about how much you regret the summer of 2013 decision. This decision is 100 times larger.

Friends, please consider whether or not it is prudent to set the Senate on fire. It is the only deliberative structure we have in our government, and at a time when institutions are being consumed, let us not consume another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF SHALANDA D. YOUNG

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise in support of Shalanda Young's nomination to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Ms. Young is a proven leader, a dedicated public servant with the experience and the expertise needed to tackle the challenges facing OMB and our Nation.

Not only does Ms. Young bring a deep knowledge of the budget process and government operations, but she has a long track record of working successfully across the aisle.

During her 14 years as a senior staff member on the House Appropriations Committee, she worked tirelessly to find a bipartisan path forward on many critical issues.

She played a key role in ending past government shutdowns and in negotiating last year's bipartisan coronavirus relief legislation.

Since President Biden announced Ms. Young's nomination, Members and staff, both Democrats and Republicans, have enthusiastically praised her ability to work with both sides and get results for the American people. This is exactly the type of leadership OMB needs to successfully steer the country through the current public health and economic crisis.

The passage of the American Rescue Plan earlier this week was a historic achievement. But much of the work to fully implement this landmark bill still lies ahead, from getting money into the pockets of workers and families to ensuring schools open swiftly and safely and making meaningful investments in small businesses and local governments.

I have no doubt Ms. Young is prepared to take on the challenging work of ensuring relief is delivered swiftly and effectively and that families, businesses, and communities across our country have the support they need to fully recover from this pandemic.

I know that in order to move past this current crisis, we must work together. We all want to end the pandemic and reinvigorate our economy, but there are intense disagreements over how we achieve those shared goals.

Ms. Young has demonstrated the ability to work hard, to find common ground during times of crisis and in the face of a deeply divided political climate, experience that makes her uniquely qualified to serve at OMB at this very moment.

Having spent most of her career working in Congress, Ms. Young will also bring a profound respect for the role of the legislative branch. She understands the importance of Congress's oversight role and has firmly pledged to work with Congress in a cooperative and a transparent manner.

Ms. Young also fully understands that laws enacted by Congress are the law of the land, and they remain the law of the land regardless of her own personal views.

You know, I know that some of my Republican colleagues have expressed concerns about Ms. Young's personal views. However, I hope they recognize that she has repeatedly committed to following the laws put forth by Congress, including laws that she may personally disagree with.

There is no doubt that Ms. Young is exceptionally qualified for this role. OMB urgently needs qualified, Senate-confirmed leaders, not only to address the current public health and economic crisis but also to strengthen Federal cybersecurity, review regulations, and modernize the Federal workforce.

In short, OMB works to ensure that every part of government is working effectively for the American people. Her budget expertise, extensive record of bipartisan engagement, and deep-rooted understanding and respect for Congress are exactly what is needed to meet the challenges that we face now and the challenges that lie ahead.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the confirmation of Shalanda Young as Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 32, Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Charles E. Schumer, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Jon Tester, Gary C. Peters, Brian Schatz, Sherrod Brown, Patty Murray, Jon Ossoff, Joe Manchin III, Thomas R. Carper, Debbie Stabenow, Martin Heinrich, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Jeanne Shaheen, Mark R. Warner, Kyrsten Sinema.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—62

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Baldwin | Hassan | Padilla |
| Bennet | Heinrich | Peters |
| Blumenthal | Hickenlooper | Reed |
| Blunt | Hirono | Rosen |
| Booker | Hoeben | Sanders |
| Brown | Hyde-Smith | Schatz |
| Burr | Kaine | Schumer |
| Cantwell | Kelly | Shaheen |
| Cardin | Kennedy | Shelby |
| Carper | King | Sinema |
| Casey | Klobuchar | Smith |
| Cassidy | Leahy | Stabenow |
| Collins | Lujan | Sullivan |
| Coons | Manchin | Sullivan |
| Cortez Masto | Markey | Tester |
| Cramer | Menendez | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Warner |
| Durbin | Murkowski | Warnock |
| Feinstein | Murphy | Warren |
| Gillibrand | Murray | Whitehouse |
| Graham | Ossoff | Wyden |

NAYS—38

| | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|
| Barrasso | Crapo | Hawley |
| Blackburn | Cruz | Inhofe |
| Boozman | Daines | Johnson |
| Braun | Ernst | Lankford |
| Capito | Fischer | Lee |
| Cornyn | Grassley | Lummis |
| Cotton | Hagerty | Marshall |